

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

ERWIN SINGH BRAICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

STEVE MITTELSTAEDT, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 07-177BHS

ORDER GRANTING STATE  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

This matter comes before the Court on State Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 76) submitted on behalf of Defendants State of Washington, Department of Financial Institutions, Tyler Letey, Shree Sharma, and Deborah Bortner ("State Defendants"). Having considered State Defendants' motion, the response by Plaintiff, and State Defendants' reply, the Court hereby grants summary judgment dismissing all claims against State Defendants for the following reasons:

**I. SUMMARY JUDGMENT STANDARD**

Summary judgment is proper only if the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). The moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law when the nonmoving party fails to make a sufficient showing on an essential element of a claim in the case on which the nonmoving party has the burden of

1 proof. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1985). There is no genuine issue of  
2 fact for trial where the record, taken as a whole, could not lead a rational trier of fact to  
3 find for the nonmoving party. *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475  
4 U.S. 574, 586 (1986) (nonmoving party must present specific, significant probative  
5 evidence, not simply “some metaphysical doubt.”). *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e).  
6 Conversely, a genuine dispute over a material fact exists if there is sufficient evidence  
7 supporting the claimed factual dispute, requiring a judge or jury to resolve the differing  
8 versions of the truth. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 253 (1986); *T.W.*  
9 *Elec. Serv., Inc. v. Pac. Elec. Contractors Ass’n*, 809 F.2d 626, 630 (9th Cir. 1987).

10 The determination of the existence of a material fact is often a close question. The  
11 court must consider the substantive evidentiary burden that the nonmoving party must  
12 meet at trial – e.g., a preponderance of the evidence in most civil cases. *Anderson*, 477  
13 U.S. at 254; *T.W. Elec. Serv., Inc.*, 809 F.2d at 630. The court must resolve any factual  
14 issues of controversy in favor of the nonmoving party only when the facts specifically  
15 attested by that party contradict facts specifically attested by the moving party. The  
16 nonmoving party may not merely state that it will discredit the moving party’s evidence at  
17 trial, in the hopes that evidence can be developed at trial to support the claim. *T.W. Elec.*  
18 *Serv., Inc.*, 809 F.2d at 630 (relying on *Anderson, supra*). Conclusory, nonspecific  
19 statements in affidavits are not sufficient, and missing facts will not be presumed. *Lujan*  
20 *v. Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n*, 497 U.S. 871, 888-89 (1990).

## 21 II. DISCUSSION


22 Based in part on the reasoning contained in the Court’s order issued on December  
23 5, 2007 (Dkt. 95) and the State Defendants’ memorandum in support of summary  
24 judgment (Dkt. 76), the affidavits of Martin Cordell (Dkt. 77), Tyler Letey (Dkt. 78),  
25 Shree Sharma (Dkt. 79), and Deborah Bortner (Dkt. 80), Plaintiff’s declaration in  
26 opposition (Dkt. 98), State Defendant’s reply (Dkt. 120), the respective pleadings of the  
27 parties and the records and files herein, as well as the lack of any evidence beyond mere  
28

1 conjecture presented by Plaintiff that would allow this court to find a disputed issue of  
2 material fact, the Court adopts the legal arguments presented by State Defendants  
3 concerning the various claims presented against them. The Court finds that there are no  
4 genuine issues of material fact with respect to any of the claims against State Defendants.  
5 As a result, summary judgment should be granted as a matter of law.

6 **III. ORDER**

7 Therefore, it is **ORDERED** that State Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment  
8 (Dkt. 76) is hereby **GRANTED**. All claims against State Defendants are hereby  
9 **DISMISSED with prejudice**.

10 DATED this 24th day of January, 2008.

11  
12  
13   
14 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28